

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**KEVIN O'NEAL COUSAN**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CRIMINAL NO. 6:25-CR-019-ADA**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

TO: THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The undersigned submits this Report and Recommendation to the district judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Rule 1 of Appendix C of the Local Court Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges. Before the Court is the petition of the United States Probation Office recommending the revocation of the defendant's term of supervision. The district judge referred the matter to the undersigned for the preparation of a report and recommendation.

**I. RECOMMENDATION**

After calling the above-referenced case for a final revocation hearing of the defendant's supervised release, the Court was informed that the parties had reached an agreement concerning the petition for revocation, alleged violations, and punishment. The parties presented an agreed order that is on the docket at Dkt. No. 17. Having reviewed the proposed order and heard comment from counsel, the Court is of the opinion that the order should be adopted. It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that the proposed order (Dkt. No. 17) be entered. It is further **RECOMMENDED** that the defendant be allowed to serve his time in the Killeen, Texas area

and that the defendant be allowed to participate in mental health counselling or treatment while in custody.

## **II. WARNINGS**

The parties may file objections to this Report and Recommendation. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings or recommendations to which objections are being made. The district court need not consider frivolous, conclusive, or general objections. *See Battles v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations contained in this Report within fourteen (14) days after the party is served with a copy of the Report shall bar that party from de novo review by the district judge of the proposed findings and recommendations in the Report and, except upon grounds of plain error, shall bar the party from appellate review of unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150-53 (1985); *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

**SIGNED** this 16th day of July, 2025.

  
DEREK T. GILLILAND  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE